

Summary of Public Comments to LSA 12-112

Written Comments

- 1) IEERB's compliance review of LBOs should either be confined to whether the parties have submitted all required documentation, or eliminated entirely. Although factfinding timelines are short, 24 hours is a short amount of time to make substantive changes, and the LBO will be reviewed for substance by the Factfinder. If IEERB does review LBOs for compliance, IEERB should include a procedure whereby it retains the ability to reject LBOs not substantially in compliance with IEERB's requirements. If the LBO is substantially compliant, IEERB should notify the submitting party, who will have twenty-four (24) hours to resubmit or provide the requested documents.
- 2) IEERB does not need to notify the parties when the LBOs have been reviewed and accepted, especially if IEERB will be notify the parties if their LBO is not compliant.

Public Hearings

A. June 22, 2012

None

B. August 16, 2012

- 1) Will IEERB be developing an LBO form pursuant to 560 IAC 2-4-3.1?
- 2) Do the parties need to include all bargained items in an LBO, or only what is in dispute?
- 3) Under 560 IAC 2-4-3.1, what happens if a party resubmits a non-compliant LBO?
- 4) Proposed rule 560 IAC 2-4-4(b) provides that parties that settle during factfinding should submit identical LBOs. Will those LBOs be reviewed by the Factfinder, and, if so, could they be rejected by the Factfinder?
- 5) Employee organizations and school employers should have equal access via email to teachers regarding representation elections.
- 6) The rules should not delete the parties' ability to request a copy of vote tallies after a mail-in representation election under 560 IAC 2-2-9(g).
- 7) Does the 60 days for declaring impasse under 560 IAC 2-4-1 run from the date the parties begin bargaining or from August 1st?
- 8) The rules should include timelines for schools to provide requested information to the exclusive representatives.